

## **R E M A R K S**

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated August 23, 2007, where the Examiner rejected claims 1-24. More specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 12-17, 22 and 24, under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaskar, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0224702, in view of De Sylva, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153357; and rejected claims 5, 7-11, 18-21 and 23, under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaskar, ‘702, and De Sylva, ‘357, further in view of Chan et al., US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/020638. However in reviewing the references in light of the claims as presently pending, the references being relied upon by the Examiner fail to make known or obvious each and every feature of the claims.

More specifically, the combination of references fail to make known or obvious a second communication connection being a direct communication connection between the user communication device and the service provider, as provided in independent claim 1; communicating service transaction data directly with the service provider, which is dispatched to a location of the user responsive to the service request and the location information, via the second communication connection upon rendering of the requested service, as provided in independent claim 13; and means for directly communicating service transaction data with a service provider dispatched to a location of the user responsive to the service request and the location information thereby completing a service transaction upon rendering of the service by the service provider, as provided in independent claim 24. In essence, there is no provision for a direct communication connection between a service provider dispatched to the location of the user and the device or apparatus of the user.

While, De Sylva, ‘357, may provide for the dispatch of a service provider, there is no direct communication between the dispatched service provider and the user device, which would facilitate the communication of service transaction data and/or the completion of a service transaction, via the direct communication connection.

The differences noted above with respect to the independent claims are similarly applicable to the claims, which depend therefrom, the noted differences not being accounted for as part of the teachings of any of the additionally cited references, namely Chan et al., ‘638. As a result, the dependent claims are similarly allowable, at least for the same reasons noted above with respect to the respective independent claim from which they depend.

In view of the present amendments, and the above noted remarks, the applicant would respectfully request that the Examiner reexamine and similarly reconsider the claims. In absence of a properly presented rejection, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BY:Lawrence Chapa/  
Lawrence J. Chapa  
Reg. No. 39,135  
Phone (847) 523-0340  
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.  
Mobile Devices  
Intellectual Property Department  
600 North US Highway 45, W4 35Q  
Libertyville, IL 60048